

## REMARKS

Claims 12-28 are presented for consideration. Claims 1-11 and 29-31 were previously withdrawn. No claim is amended. No claim is cancelled

The "Response to Arguments" section of the current Office Action appear to raise the possibility of some misunderstandings on Applicant's part, or on the Office Action's part, of the cited reference as it is being used to read on the present claim language. Applicants would like to address these possible misunderstandings since some of the rejections in the present Office Action appear to be rooted in the misunderstandings.

On page 8, Item 3, the Office Action organizes its response into three subsections labeled "A", "B", and "C". In section "A", the Office Action states,

"In the remarks applicant argue[s] in substance that A) Yacoub does not disclose a server [that] provides access to an application that in turn provides selectable access to a plurality of independent activities. In response to A), Claimed subject matter not the specification is the measure of the invention. Disclosure contained in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding prior art ... nowhere in the claim does it specify what the independent activities are and what they are independent of".

Applicants respectfully note that the second paragraph of claim 12 recites,

"a network server having a remotely accessible application providing selectable access to a plurality of independent activities, said network server maintaining a cross-reference list associating each of said independent activities with at least one of a plurality of approved periphery devices;"

What the specific activities are is not critical to the invention, as claimed, and applicants did not seek to incorporate any specific activity as a limitation into the present claims. What is important is that the activities be independent, and that the server maintain a cross-reference list associating each independent activity with a periphery device. Furthermore, from the text, it is quite clear that the independent activities are obviously independent of each other.

In the previous Office Action, Applicants had assumed that the Office Action was equating the claimed activities with print parameters, since Yacoub uses the submitted print parameters to generate a list of qualified printers among a plurality of network printers that are cable of supporting the submitted print parameters, and then submits the print job to an available, qualified printer closest to the user. The previous Office Action had cited Yacoub col. 7, lines 16 to 46, which describes this process.

Therefore, in Applicant's previous arguments, Applicants objected to the equating of "independent activities" with "parameters" that described attributes of a single print job. Applicant cited examples of independent activities listed in the specification in order to better highlight the differences between an activity and a series of related print parameters for a specific print job.

Applicants repeatedly attempted to contact Examiner Nano to have clear up any misunderstanding on either part. Although Applicants were not able to reach the examiner, Examiner Nano did leave two voice mail messages for Applicant in which he explained that he was not equating activities with parameters. Rather, Examiner Nano explained that he was equating activities with different print jobs. This explanation, however, raised other issues regarding the Office Action's interpretation of the claim language.

As is noted above, the second paragraph of claim 12 requires that the network server have a "remotely accessible application" that provides a client computing device with selectable access to "a plurality of independent activities". The third paragraph of claim 12, thus recites, "a client computing device for remote communication with said network server and for requesting access to said plurality of independent activities;" This limitations requires that the client computing device request access to the plurality of independent activities. If one were to substitute "print jobs" in place of "independent activities", then this would require that the network server have an application that provides selectable access to a plurality of independent print jobs, and that a client device request access to the plurality of independent print jobs.

This is clearly contrary to Yacoub's teaching. Yacoub requires that his client device generate its own print job, and integrate into its print job a list of

chosen print parameters. Yacoub's client device then submits the generated print job and list of print parameters to Yacoub's server, which in turn checks the printing parameters against a list printers and their capabilities. This is explain in Yacoub col. 7, lines 16 to 46, and especially in lines 16-19, which state,

"First, according to step 300, the user/client requests a print job. The print job may be generated by software or an application within the client workstation of the user who selects a print command from the application. ... Next, according to step 330, the print job is spooled to the server. The server will be capable of containing many such print jobs from different users and clients on the network

As is clearly stated above, the print job is generated within the user client workstation. Thus, the print job is not provide by the server and requested from the server, as the Office Action appears to imply. Rather, the print job is generated as a result of a print request to software, or an application, resident within the client workstation. Once the print job is generated, it (along with its selected printing parameters) is sent (i.e. spooled) to the network server, which stores many such print jobs from different respective users and clients.

The point is that Yacoub's user (i.e. workstation) does not select one print job from among a plurality of selectable print jobs provided by the server. Rather, Yacoub's user (i.e. workstation) submits its own print job to the network server for printing. Thus, Applicants are at a loss to determine how Yacoub can read on the current claim language.

Furthermore, the fourth paragraph identifies an "accessory computing device", as being coupled as a periphery device to the client computing device. As it is known in the art, a periphery device (or peripheral) is attached to a host device. This is explained, for example, in IEEE100, "The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms", Seventh Edition, Copyright © 2000 by the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, Inc., wherein it defines peripheral as,

**"peripheral** (1) A device, attached to a host via a communication link. (C/MM) 1284-1994  
(2) Pertaining to a device that operates in combination or conjunction with the computer but is not physically part of the computer and is not essential to the basic operation of the

system; for example, printers, keyboards, graphic digital converters, disks, and tape drives. *Note:* Such devices are often referred to as "peripherals" or "peripheral equipment." *See also:* input-output device. (C) 610.10-1994w

The second paragraph of claim 12 further requires that the network server maintain a cross-reference list associating each of the *selectable* independent activities with at least one of a plurality of approved periphery devices.

In page 9, section "C", the Office Action states that

"applicant argue that Yacoub does not disclose that the user identify one specific periphery device. In response to C), Yacoub discloses if a busy signal is returned the user is given a choice between of waiting for the current printer or having the server choose the next available appropriate printer (see abstract)."

Further limitations for identifying a periphery device to the server are found at least in claims 16, 17, 18, 20, and 21. Applicant are at a loss to determine how the act of choosing to wait for a current printer or electing to have the server search for an alternate printer reads on the present client device identifying its attached periphery device to the network server. Applicants respectfully request clarifying of the Office Action's position.

Nonetheless, having established that the recited periphery device is attached to the claimed client computing device, and that the server maintains a list associating each selectable independent activity with at least one corresponding periphery device, one now can turn to the last paragraph of claim 12, which states,

" said network server denies said client computing device access to any of said plurality of independent activities in response to said accessory computing device not being among said plurality of approved periphery devices."

This states that if the specific periphery device attached to the claimed client computing device is not among the "approved periphery devices" in the server's cross-reference list, then the user is not permitted access to any of the selectable, independent activities.

On page 9, Section "B", The current Office Action explains that Applicant had previously argued that Yacoub does not teach the denial of access to any of the plurality of independent activities. However, the Office Action responds by explaining that,

"Yacoub discloses the denial of access to an independent activities if the access computing device is not an approved peripheral device, however an independent activity from another approved device can be granted access even though it may be a similar activity (see col. 5 lines 29-43 )."

Applicant is not clear on what the above statement is saying. However, the above-cited Yacoub excerpt states (col. 5 lines 29-43 )

" Likewise, in the case of a printer error, if either the highest quality printer or the fastest printer returns some error code, such as "out of paper", then, according to step 250, the server will find an available printer which is not busy and which does not return any error messages. Thus, the user is relieved of the burdens of trying to determine and select the most appropriate printer for his job. The user has already selected the speed and quality at which the print job is preferably printed and there the burden ends once the appropriate printer is found to print the job, the job is printed (step 260). Preferences can be set either by default or through a changing dialog box or menu, after which the user needs only to wait for the notification of where his print job was printed to. According to step 270, the user is notified of the location of the printed job."

The above excerpt merely states that if a printer that Yacoub's server has chosen for a print job is unavailable, then Yacoub's server will keep looking for an alternate printer until a suitable, available printer is found. The above excerpt makes no mention of denying the client computing device access to any selectable activity if its attached periphery device is not among a list of associated periphery devices maintained at the server. Indeed, the above excerpt explains that once a user has submitted a print job, no further action is required of it. It merely waits until the server notifies it that the server located a suitable printer and routed the print job to the located printer.

Thus, Yacoub does not teach, or suggest, having any conditions for permitting a user to select among multiple print jobs, or for denying a user selection of any print job. Indeed, since Yacoub requires that the user create (i.e.

generate) its own print job and then send the created print job to the server for printing, how can Yacoub's server deny a client computing device access to a print job it generated, and is physically located within the client computing device, itself? By virtue of having generated it, the client device has access to the print job to do with as it wishes. In the present case, Yacoub recommends that the client device choose to send its print job to the network server for printing.

Furthermore, once the print job is sent to the server, the user still has no option for selecting the print job. The print job as already been created, and sent, what is there to select? Yacoub explains that if the printer its server chooses for printing the print job is busy, or otherwise unavailable, then it will seek another printer. If the printer is busy, the network server give the user the choice of waiting for the printer to be ready, or permit the server to select another printer. Applicants are at a loss to determine how this printing sequence can read on the present claim language.

Claim 13 further states that if the specific periphery device attached to the client computing device is among the server's list of approved periphery device, then the server will permit the client computing device to select only among those independent activities individually associated with the specific periphery device. Yacoub does not teach any such sub-selection of independent activities as determined by a specific printer attached to a specific client device.

Claim 14 describes a sequence by which the presently claimed network server may deny access to a client device. Claim 14 explains that the server provides the client computing device with the list of selectable independent activities. Once the client device has made a selection, the network server first checks the client device's attached periphery device to determine if the attached periphery device is associated with the selected activity. If the periphery device is not associated with the activity, then the network server denies the client device access its selected activity. Again, Yacoub does not teach any sequence where a client device is given choice of multiple print jobs to choose from, and once the client device selects one print job from among the list, Yacoub's server determines if the printer attached to the client device is associated with the selected print job, and then decides to ether permit or deny the client device

access to the selected print job. Indeed, in this interpretation of claim language, it is not clear what is meant by "access to a print job". Applicant requests that Examiner explain what is meant by giving a client device access to a selected print job from among a list of selectable print jobs, since the client device does not print a print job, but rather one of Yacoub's network printers prints the print job.

Claim 16 further requires that the client device select (i.e. identify) its own periphery device. This is clearly contrary to Yacoub, which requires that his server select a printer for printing a client-submitted print job. The only choice Yacoub permits a client device is to decide whether to wait for a busy printer, or to permit Yacoub's sever to choose an alternate printer for printing.

In an alternate approach, claim 19 requires that the claimed network server first identify the periphery device attached to the client computing device, then identify all the independent activities associated with the identified periphery device, and finally provide the client device with a list showing only the selectable independent activities associated with the identified periphery device. Applicants are at loss to determine how Yacoub's teachings can read on this approach since Yacoub does not provide any print jobs for the client device to choose from, but rather depends on the client device to generate its own print job and subsequently submit it to the server. Assuming that, as Examiner Nano stated, Yacoub's print jobs are equated to the presently claimed selectable, independent activities, where does Yacoub teach giving a client device a list of print jobs to choose from? Furthermore, where does Yacoub teach that such a list is first filtered by removing any print job not associated with a specific printer attached to the client device?

Applicant's respectfully request clarification of the issues raised above.

Entry of this Response After Final Rejection, as an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, he is respectfully requested to contact applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

/Rosalio Haro/  
Rosalio Haro  
Registration No. 42,633

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.  
Intellectual Property Department  
150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225  
San Jose, CA 95134  
Customer No. 20178  
Phone: (408) 952-6131  
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058  
Customer No. 20178

Date: July 5, 2006